

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of:)
Jagger et al.) Group Art Unit: 2443
)
Application No. 10/072,708) Examiner: Bilgrami, Asghar H.
)
Filed: 02/05/2002) Atty. Docket No.
) NAI1P314/01.166.01
)
For: SPAM REPORT GENERATION) Date: 10/22/2009
SYSTEM AND METHOD)
)
_____)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an Examiner Interview Summary which took place in the above-identified application 10/14/2009 and 10/21/2009 with Examiner Bilgrami.

- ☒ Applicant(s) believe that no Extension of Time is required; however, if it is determined that such an extension is required, Applicant(s) hereby petition that such an extension be granted and authorize the Commissioner to charge the required fees for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P314).
- ☒ If the required fees are missing or any additional fees are required to facilitate filing the enclosed response, please charge such fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P314).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC

/KEVINZILKA/

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 971-2573

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of:)
Jagger et al.) Group Art Unit: 2443
Application No. 10/072,708)
Filed: 02/05/2002) Examiner: Bilgrami, Asghar H.
For: SPAM REPORT GENERATION) Atty. Docket No.
SYSTEM AND METHOD) NAIIP314/01.166.01
_____) Date: 10/22/2009
)
)
)

Examiner Interview

Date of interview 10/14/2009 and 10/21/2009

Type of interview Telephonic

Name of participant(s): Examiner Asghar Bilgrami, Jamie Rossi

Exhibit shown? None

Claims discussed Claims 1, 13 and 22

Prior art discussed None

Substance of interview On 10/14/2009 Examiner Asghar Bilgrami stated that Claims 1, 13 and 22 would be allowable if amended to include the subject matter of dependent Claim 32. Examiner Asghar Bilgrami also suggested amending the Specification to remove the sentence on Page 15, lines 3-5 in order to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claim 22. In response, Jamie Rossi proposed that Claim 22 was allowable by virtue of the term “tangible” in the preamble of the claim, or in the alternative suggested that Claim 22 be amended to include Claim 23 (in the amended form shown below), to overcome the 101 rejection.

23. (Currently Amended) The computer product of claim 22 wherein the computer readable medium includes at least one of memory, CD-ROM, floppy disk, tape, flash memory, system memory, and hard drive.

On 10/21/2009 Examiner Asghar Bilgrami indicated that neither the term “tangible” nor the incorporation of Claim 23 (shown above) would be sufficient to overcome the 101 rejection, and insisted that the only way to overcome the 101 rejection was to amend the Specification. Examiner Asghar Bilgrami also confirmed for Jamie Rossi that the requested amendment to the Specification would not be an introduction of new matter.

Agreement reached? Yes. Jamie Rossi agreed to amend Claims 1, 13 and 22 to include the subject matter of dependent Claim 32 and to remove the sentence on Page 15, lines 3-5 of the Specification in order to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claim 22.